



**NEIGHBORHOOD ENHANCEMENT COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Thursday, June 7, 2007
Granite Reef Senior Center, Room #8
1700 N. Granite Reef Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85257**

- PRESENT:** Christine Schild, Chair
Aaron Kern, Vice-Chair (arrived at 4:42 p.m.)
Patricia Badenoch, Commissioner
John Horwitz, Commissioner
Jeff Kidder, Commissioner
Cristina Lenko, Commissioner
Jim Pompe, Commissioner
- STAFF:** Joanie Mead, Neighborhood Education Manager
- GUESTS:** Connie Butler, Country Estates (NG 1-07)
Nancy Cantor
Alison Drummond, Scottsdale Gardens (HOA-2-07)
Abby Fink, Scottsdale Gardens (HOA 2-07)
Jim Heather
John Lusardi, Long Range Planning Director
Linda Messenger, Woodleaf (HOA 3-07)
Tim Moore, Planner
John Oberitter
Darlene Peterson
Bryan Sarchi, Planner
Mary Troyan, Planner
Lanny VanEman, Las Villas (HOA 1-07)
John Washington
Carrie Wilhelme, Planner

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Schild called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m. A roll call confirmed the presence of Commissioners as noted above.

1. Re-approval of April 4, 2007, and approval of May 9, 2007 Meeting Minutes.

Chair Schild pointed out the need for re-approval of the April 4, 2007 Minutes to include Brent Stockwell in the guest list since he facilitated the retreat.

COMMISSIONER KIDDER MOVED TO RE-APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007 MEETING AS AMENDED AND TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 9, 2007 MEETING. COMMISSIONER LENKO SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED WITH A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

2. Community Area Planning and the 2011 General Plan Update—John Lusardi, Long Range Planning Director and Carrie Wilhelme, Associate Planner

Chair Schild welcomed guests, Long Range Planning Director John Lusardi, and Associate Planner Carrie Wilhelme. Mr. Lusardi introduced Planning Department staff members Tim Moore, Bryan Sarchi, and Mary Troyan.

Mr. Lusardi reported that he would begin the presentation with a summary of the work program focusing on the General Plan Update and the Community Area Plan process inclusive of the Planning Department's vision of the Commission's role in the process.

Planning and Development Services Overview:

Mr. Lusardi explained that Planning and Development Services consisted of two divisions:

1. Planning, Customer Services & Administration
 - Current Planning
 - Advance Planning
 - Support, Communication, Technology, and Budget
2. Development Services
 - Inspections & Land Survey Services
 - One Stop Shop/Records
 - Building/Engineering Consulting Team

Mr. Lusardi summarized that Planning, Customer Services & Administration handles the development review process and rezoning cases, and Development Services handles building inspections and surveys. He pointed out that Advance Planning was his department and they would be discussing their role in the program.

Mr. Lusardi explained that Planning, Customer Services & Administration was also divided into two sections:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Design Services<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Design Services and Guidelines• Corridor Studies• Design Studio | <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Planning and Policy<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Long-Range Planning and Policy• General Plan Update/Review Policy• Zoning Ordinances Update |
|---|---|

Mr. Lusardi summarized that they provide design services and guidelines to the city both in city projects and private development by assisting with transportation planning

and corridor studies. He reported that they are currently developing a design studio to be used as a strong educational element of the community design where they would meet with collaborating entities such as ASU, Taliesin West, and the community in developing design guidelines and standards.

Mr. Lusardi pointed out that Ms. Wilhelme would be discussing the Long Range Planning and Policy subsection of the department. He explained that they were also responsible for the 2011 General Plan Update, the Annual General Plan review process, and the Zoning Ordinance update.

Mr. Lusardi recalled their previous presentation to the Commission regarding the R1-7 work program and noted that they would return with an update in the future.

Advance Planning Work Program Overview:

Mr. Lusardi reported that their department was working on a Council directed work program consisting of the following:

- Policy and Plan Alignment—June 2005 Council Work Study Session
- Greater Airpark Area Plan—2006 State of the City Address
- Southern Scottsdale Plan—2006 State of the City Address
- Downtown Plan Update—Completion early 2008
- Community Area Planning—2007 State of the City Address
- Coordinate with Transportation Planning and Economic Vitality
- General Plan Update 2011—State mandated update every 10 years

Mr. Lusardi explained that the Downtown Plan Update was underway with an anticipated completion date of early 2008 and has been launched with the Arizona Townhall. He stated that City Council directed their department to do a study session to develop a Community Area Plan process and model ultimately leading to the 2011 General Plan.

Mr. Lusardi noted that Advance Planning also coordinates with Transportation Planning and Economic Vitality and their current focus was on the Transportation Master Plan. He stated that they were also gearing their work program to update the General Plan in 2011.

2011 General Plan Update:

Ms. Wilhelme reported that the General Plan was an overarching policy document for the city last updated in 2001 and ratified by the citizens in 2002. She pointed out that the Growing Smarter Act requires that the General Plan be updated every 10 years.

Ms. Wilhelme stated that the General Plan update process includes extensive community outreach that takes an average of three to five years to complete in order to represent the view of the entire city.

Ms. Wilhelme summarized that the General Plan consisted of 12 elements:

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|
| • Character and Design | • Open Space and Recreation |
| • Land Use | • Preservation and Environmental |
| • Economic Vitality | • Cost of Development |
| • Community Involvement | • Growth Areas |

- Housing
- Neighborhoods
- Public Services and Facilities
- Transportation and Community Mobility

Ms. Wilhelme explained that each of the elements had a list of values that the community felt was important along with a list of goals and strategies to reach those goals.

General Plan Definition:

Ms. Wilhelme defined the General Plan as being a statement of city policies designed to fluctuate with the growth of the city and the opinions of its citizens. She stated that it guides the decision making process and provides a framework for specific planning such as the Transportation Master Plan that tries to implement the community mobility element of the General Plan.

Ms. Wilhelme noted that it was also a tool for education/communication and was a mechanism for providing a long-range perspective.

Community Area Planning:

Ms. Wilhelme stated that there were three levels of planning and Community Area Planning would be focusing on the middle layer:

- Community Based Planning: encourages community involvement, identifies issues and opportunities, examines regional influences, proactively plans for the future, achieves policy and plan alignment
- Accomplished by creating planning areas in a city
- Each area has a long range community plan
- Provides for Commission and Board input

Ms. Wilhelme reported that there would be a very active outreach focus to gain attention and to identify issues/opportunities for the examined areas. She presented a map illustrating the six areas selected for community area planning: downtown, southern Scottsdale, Shea Corridor, Greater Airpark area, McDowell Vistas, and Tonto Foothills. Mr. Lusardi reported that currently they were targeting one workshop for each community area plan to get started.

Ms. Wilhelme noted that the Community Area Planning structure consisted of four sections and there would be public workshops throughout the process encouraging the Boards and Commissions to attend:

- Six Community Planning Areas
- Each area will have a City Council appointed Community Area Group
- Commission and Board participation
- Each area will have a workshop to kick off the process—Greater Airpark Area workshop scheduled for Fall 2007

Ms. Wilhelme explained that they would obtain the public's vision for their area in order to identify issues and resolutions to be used in the creation of the Community Area plan. She stated that ultimately the Community Area Plan would be used to update the 2011 General Plan.

Alignment of Plans and Policies:

Ms. Wilhelme reported that staff gathered a list of all of their plans and policies and separated them geographically to designate which ones are citywide, topic specific, and neighborhoods. She stated that they then figured out which plans affected a specific area out of the six community areas selected, in order to create a correlating section for each one.

Neighborhoods and the General Plan:

Ms. Wilhelme elaborated that City Council has seven goals they wish to reach with the General Plan and the main goal was to:

“Enhance and protect a diverse, family-oriented community where neighborhoods are safe and protect from adverse impacts well maintained and actively revitalized.”

Ms. Wilhelme noted that during the 2001 General Plan update, one of the CityShape 2020 six guiding principles was to enhance neighborhoods. She pointed out that neighborhoods were referenced in all 12 elements of the General Plan.

Ms. Wilhelme explained that the neighborhood element has five goals with 28 strategies to reach those goals. For example, in order to enhance and protect diverse neighborhoods so they are safe and well maintained the city must provide for the neighborhood and social services needs of all citizens or provide neighborhood recreational facilities and parks.

Ms. Wilhelme articulated that they plan to sustain and protect the neighborhoods by developing and revitalizing based on community input, and preserving historical buildings. She presented a planet diagram illustrating the department’s vision for the General Plan element alignment and provided a schedule outline of which Boards and Commissions they would be approaching regarding the General Plan update.

Neighborhood Enhancement Commission’s Role:

Ms. Wilhelme stated that the role of the Commission was to support and encourage programs and policies that are consistent with the General Plan, provide feedback and review of draft policies, participate in community workshops, and to support implementation of the program.

Mr. Lusardi commented that they were just providing an introduction to the plan and it was incumbent upon the Commission to bring forth suggestions to assist with the development of plans/policies to be implemented to regulation.

Discussion:

In response to Commissioner Lenko’s inquiry regarding workshop participation, Mr. Lusardi responded that they would like Commission/Board participation in listening and relaying community concerns to their department. He pointed out that they are also requesting assistance in increasing excitement and participation in the program.

In response to Commissioner Kidder’s inquiry regarding community notification of workshops, Mr. Lusardi stated that there would be a combination of direct mailings/tracking, website development, and newspaper advertising.

Vice-Chair Kern requested that they provide examples of how the General Plan would focus on providing neighborhoods with a sense of identity and pride in their

neighborhoods. Mr. Lusardi emphasized that the General Plan was a policy and strategy document that would not provide specifics about what to do in particular neighborhoods, but would provide enhancements to protect character and address mobility issues. Ms. Wilhelme suggested that the Commission refer to the Community Character section of the General Plan for more information.

In response to Chair Schild's inquiry regarding formulating the community area groups, Mr. Lusardi stated that the workshops should generate enthusiasm for residents and/or business owners to participate in the community area groups and the groups themselves would be appointed by City Council.

Mr. Lusardi reported that they envision one to three members from each community group becoming part of the General Plan Task Force.

In response to Ms. Cantor's inquiry regarding when the Community Area Planning proposal would go before City Council, Mr. Lusardi stated that they would bring a specific work program to City Council in the fall.

Discussion ensued regarding how the six community areas were selected and why the downtown and Greater Airpark areas were given priority over the southern Scottsdale area that was not going to be initiated until spring 2008. Mr. Lusardi reported that the order was designated as a matter of priority at the direction of City Council.

Ms. Cantor pointed out that there had been a lack of input from the community when compared to developer input provided to the Planning Commission. She stated that there was a large group of residential representatives in attendance to voice their concerns regarding development issues and their willingness to participate in the planning process.

Mr. Lusardi suggested that the citizens attend the City Council in the fall to voice their concerns regarding southern Scottsdale. Ms. Cantor argued that in 2003 the community requested that the city provide policies for guiding infill development and the City Manager informed them that they wanted to take everything on a project-by-project basis.

Mr. Lusardi remarked that they would convey the priority concerns to administration and City Council, pointing out that it was incumbent upon the Commission to relay their priorities to City Council as well. He opined that staff could only handle two to three plans at one time and the downtown plan was initiated before they began the process.

Mr. John Washington reported that Council Member Drake and others have indicated that there would be crosspollination between the community area groups and inquired how that was possible when the planned areas were not being formed simultaneously. Mr. Lusardi explained that community plans do overlap and affect each other and they have been lacking in considering external regional influences. He noted that they had identified transition issues and were addressing the issue of community involvement and input in the downtown update.

In response to Mr. Washington's inquiry regarding a downtown community area group, Mr. Lusardi explained that the Town Hall was the kickoff workshop and the area plan group discussion would be going before City Council in July.

In response to Ms. Peterson's inquiry regarding the General Plan influencing the Planning Commission and Development Review Board regarding heights and densities in southern Scottsdale, Mr. Lusardi responded that the General Plan only addresses those issues at a policy level versus a regulatory level. He stated that it was incumbent upon the Planning Department to set forth legislation or zoning regulations to implement the General Plan.

In response to Ms. Peterson's concerns regarding the developers' input being considered over the citizens, Mr. Lusardi stated that they have laid out their planned work programs providing citizens the opportunity for input and participation.

Vice-Chair Kern commented that they presented an exciting proposal that would allow the citizens to voice their views and to make a difference in future planning by participation.

Mr. Heather presented a book titled "Images of America Scottsdale" which was available at Costco. He stated that it provided an excellent overview of how Scottsdale looked at the beginning versus how it looks today.

Chair Schild thanked Mr. Lusardi and Ms. Wilhelme for their presentation and suggested that they take a short break before beginning the grant hearings portion of the meeting.

3. Presentation and possible Commission action on a Neighborhood Enhancement Partnership (NEP) request from Las Villas (HOA 1-07)

Chair Schild reconvened the meeting, requesting that the Las Villas Homeowner's Association representative present on behalf of their organization.

Mr. VanEman reported that Scott Robertson was out of the country and he would be presenting on his behalf. He explained that their project included water conservation and neighborhood beautification.

Mr. VanEman stated they had problems with upkeep of the grass in-between the sidewalk and along their retaining wall as well as three citrus trees. They have resolved to cap off their water supply to 3,000 sq. ft. of grass and citrus trees to be replaced by desert landscaping.

In response to Commissioner Badenoch's inquiry regarding the project previously approved by the NEP, Mr. VanEman responded that they elevated a wall two blocks on north Scottsdale approximately 600-800 feet to alleviate garbage and noise issues. He explained that they maintain the grass outside of the wall and between the sidewalk and the wall.

In response to Commissioner Lenko's inquiry regarding desert plants to be included in the xeriscape, Mr. VanEman stated that there would be none and the gravel would be consistent with the gravel in front of the fire station located at 7100 E. McDonald.

In response to Commissioner Horwitz' inquiry regarding the removal of the ground lighting system, Mr. VanEman explained that an automobile previously smashed into two of their ground light fixtures which were never repaired.

Commissioner Kidder raised a question of safety liability regarding the sweat equity portion of the project where chainsaws would be used to remove the citrus trees. Ms. Mead explained that according to the guidelines all applications must sign a hold harmless agreement to protect the city against such accidents.

Commissioner Badenoch expressed her non-support of the grant application and argued that replacing grass with gravel creates a hot and inhospitable environment, and she did not see how the project would enhance the aesthetics of the neighborhood. She also pointed out that the sweat equity amount of \$1,659.68 was steep. Chair Schild remarked that the hours allowed for sweat equity did not seem unreasonable and applauded the Homeowners Association for taking on the projects.

Mr. VanEman responded that they would be saving water, removing the citrus trees would alleviate roof rat issues, and the implementation of gravel would match the neighborhood landscaping. He pointed out that the sweat equity amount was negotiable and they planned to replace the citrus trees with trees that require less water and which would alleviate the roof rat problem.

Commissioner Badenoch reported that she visited their gated community and found that many of the residents were unaware of the projects being considered. Mr. VanEman recalled that they discussed the projects at their last March meeting along with another meeting six months prior. He stated that they were balancing their books and made enormous improvements by painting their neighborhood without increasing residential assessments.

In response to Vice-Chair Kern's inquiry regarding benefits to the surrounding community, Mr. VanEman reported that there was no significant benefit and noted that it was a challenge to keep their area clean as a result of increased traffic. He recalled that outsiders damaged one of the community streetlights about every three months.

Mr. VanEman reported that they switched to fluorescent saline lighting to save energy and they have 100% of their ground and home lighting installed.

Vice-Chair Kern stated that they were doing a wonderful job being involved in their neighborhood and asked Ms. Mead whether there was a city statute or requirement regarding the removal of city barricades not in use.

In response to Ms. Mead's inquiry regarding the position of barricades, Mr. VanEman explained that barricades with flashing lights were positioned between the fire station and their gated community.

Ms. Mead requested that Mr. VanEman contact her after the meeting regarding removal of the barricades and pointed out that they could use the Tool Trailer when implementing the sweat equity portion of their project. Mr. VanEman stated that he contacted the barricade company and they were not willing to discuss the problem.

COMMISSIONER KIDDER MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE LAS VILLAS (HOA 1-07) GRANT APPLICATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,413.08. COMMISSIONER HORWITZ SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED WITH A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ONE (1), COMMISSIONER BADENOCH DISSENTED.

4. Presentation and possible Commission action on a Neighborhood Enhancement Partnership (NEP) request from Scottsdale Gardens (HOA 2-07)

Ms. Fink stated that she was the President of the Board of Directors and introduced Alison Drummond as Secretary. She reported that they were requesting funding on two projects at Scottsdale Gardens: 1) the repainting of the curbs emergency red; and 2) the replacement of their heated pool and spa solar panels. She explained that the solar panels were originally installed 10 years ago and over the past six to eight months several of the panels have shown the need for replacement.

Ms. Fink reported that they only provided single bids for each due to the fact that the community would be repainting the curbs and the installation/maintenance company would be replacing the solar panels.

Commissioner Badenoch recommended the project, stating that it meets the grant application guidelines, reflects the Green Building program, and the sweat equity demonstrates neighborhood cooperation with intent to contribute.

Chair Schild remarked that it was important to repaint the emergency curbs to allow access by the Fire and Police Departments. She agreed that the installation of solar panels was an environmental and sound business decision. Chair Schild expressed her appreciation of their up-to-date reserve study and following through with the reserve recommendations.

COMMISSIONER HORWITZ MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SCOTTSDALE GARDENS (HOA 2-07) GRANT APPLICATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$366.20. COMMISSIONER BADENOCH SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED WITH A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

5. Presentation and possible Commission action on a Neighborhood Enhancement Partnership (NEP) request from Country Estates (NG 1-07)

Ms. Butler reported that she initiated the signage project by distributing 80 letters receiving about 50 responses from her neighbors in the area of 63rd Street and Indian School. She followed up with a letter requesting support and/or small donations that initiated an excellent response.

Ms. Butler stated that she had been a resident for the past 20 years and many of the responses to her hot pink letters were from residents of 40 years. She followed up with a third letter that scheduled a neighborhood meeting that resulted in a favorable response.

Ms. Butler explained that when she brought their grant application to Ms. Mead, they realized that the sign they originally designed was too large for the sight distance on Indian School Road. They then redesigned a smaller low maintenance sign and at about the same time a car hit one of their two original signs.

Ms. Butler reported that they raised \$1,500 to assist with the planned projects and neighbors have offered to assist with the distribution of gravel and landscaping.

Commissioner Badenoch opined that raising money to support a neighborhood improvement project in a non-HOA was very impressive and their presentation was very organized. Pride and ownership was demonstrated throughout the application process and the effort alone demonstrated a community coming together in support of each other.

Commissioner Kidder congratulated Ms. Butler on picking up the ball and running with it and thanked her neighbors for getting involved.

Vice-Chair Kern appreciated the neighborhood rallying together to initiate the projects presented. Ms. Butler pointed out that somebody needed to develop the group organization.

Ms. Mead opined that Ms. Butler created an excellent application package and requested that it be used as an example at future NEP workshops.

COMMISSIONER LENKO MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE COUNTRY ESTATES (NG 1-07) GRANT APPLICATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$5,420.02. COMMISSIONER BADENOCH SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED WITH A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

6. Presentation and possible Commission action on a Neighborhood Enhancement Partnership (NEP) request from Woodleaf (HOA 3-07)

Ms. Messenger reported that she was the Secretary of Woodleaf and their Homeowners Association consisted of 20 homeowners owning residences located at 74th Street and Palo Verde originally built in 1978. She stated that their application addressed deferred maintenance due to budgetary issues.

Ms. Messenger distributed a copy of the NEP program article to their homeowners to educate them on the avenues available to improve their community. She explained that they came to an agreement to address the wall issues such as dust and dirt.

Ms. Messenger reported that they raised their dues, agreed to a special assessment of \$1,050 per homeowner to be initiated between June 1, 2007 and July 1, 2007, and enacted the Community Enhancement Code. She opined that without proper funding the financial difficulties resulting from deferred maintenance would continue.

Commissioner Badenoch stated that they presented a well-organized and thoughtful application and expressed her appreciation of the thought and consideration of the plant material. She commented that the repainting of the walls, replacement of the lights, and the improvement of the entry signage would contribute to the enhancement safety issues of the project and the sweat equity demonstrated community involvement.

In response to Commissioner Kidder's inquiry regarding the reason a reserve study was never prepared, Ms. Messenger responded that the lack of education contributed to the problems. She expressed her surprise when she saw the list of other neighborhoods that received grant approval in their surrounding area.

Ms. Messenger agreed that a reserve study would be on the forefront and they plan on designing a step-by-step process to prepare for escalating maintenance costs. Commissioner Kidder pointed out that the lack of a reserve study might affect the sale prices of their homes.

Ms. Messenger stated that she had lived in the community since 1985 and reported that three homes already changed hands recently and they had one home being renovated before being sold.

Chair Schild appreciated the approval of their special assessment that demonstrated their level of financial commitment to their proposed improvements. She stated that it was a terrific project followed up with a thoughtful application. Ms. Messenger noted that they have begun to understand and appreciate the fact that their property was special because of its excellent location.

In response to Vice-Chair Kern's inquiry regarding the assessments affecting residents with fixed incomes, Ms. Messenger reported that only three supportive homeowners voiced a concern.

In response to Commissioner Kidder's inquiry regarding the yearly assessment, Ms. Messenger responded that the annual dues were \$800 that was raised to \$1,200.

Ms. Mead stated that Ms. Messenger's multifaceted application reflected her hard work and cooperation with the other homeowners and requested that their application be used as another example in upcoming NEP workshops.

COMMISSIONER BADENOCH MOVED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE WOODLEAF (HOA 3-07) GRANT APPLICATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,537.50. COMMISSIONER LENKO SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED WITH A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

7. Discussion and possible Commission action regarding Commission recommendations to City Council on NEP grant applications—Raun Keagy, Neighborhood Services Director and Joanie Mead, Neighborhood Education Manager

Chair Schild requested that they begin their discussion with the Las Villas Homeowner's Association application and suggested that all applicants attend the City Council meeting on July 10, 2007 to support approval of the Commission's recommendations.

Commissioner Kidder recommended approval of the Las Villas application as presented and Commissioner Badenoch expressed her opposition to the application. Mr. VanEman expressed his appreciation of the Commission's support and pointed out their new Board of Directors has scheduled annual spring and fall cleaning events.

In response to Commissioner Pompe's inquiry regarding the formula used to calculate the amount requested on the Scottsdale Gardens application, Ms. Fink responded that they used the two bids received along with the sweat equity to figure out the amount applied for. Ms. Mead provided a brief explanation of the 75/25 formula inclusive of the neighborhood match.

Commissioner Horwitz recommended approval of the Scottsdale Gardens application as presented and the Commission agreed with the recommendation.

Commissioner Lenko recommended approval of the Country Estates application as presented and the Commission agreed with the recommendation.

Commissioner Badenoch recommended approval of the Woodleaf application as presented and the Commission agreed with the recommendation.

Commissioner Kidder expressed his concern regarding the lack of a reserve study and requested that the Woodleaf Homeowner's Association be educated on the need for such a study. A lengthy discussion ensued, clarifying the Commission's desire to possibly mandate that all NEP applicants include a reserve study with their applications.

Chair Schild encouraged the applicant to reapply in the future for funding of a reserve study. Ms. Mead reported that a community could receive funding one time within a 12-month period. Commissioner Horwitz recommended that they agendaize a reserve study discussion.

Chair Schild suggested that any neighborhood applying for a specific amount must be required to present a reserve study or the proposed project must include a funding request for a reserve study. Ms. Mead pointed out that such a request might institute a change to the Commission's guidelines and stated that she would encourage reserve studies during the orientation workshops.

Ms. Mead stated that she would send all applicants a reminder email regarding the July 10, 2007 City Council meeting and explained that all approved cases have six months to complete their projects and must apply for an extension should they anticipate any delays.

8. Staff and Commission Updates (A.R.S. § 38-431.02 (K)).

Ms. Mead reported that staff was recently informed by Financial Services that no leftover funds would be rolled over into the next year and explained that they would secure the funds for the last group of applicants approved by City Council a few months ago.

Ms. Mead stated that tonight's application recommendations will be funded from the 2007/08 budget. Chair Schild suggested that they change their spring grant application hearing from June to May to be able to meet the June City Council approval meeting in order to keep the grants within the budget year.

Ms. Mead pointed out that the current 2006/07 approximate balance of \$47,000 demonstrates that the NEP program would never exceed its budget. Discussion ensued regarding changing the spring grant cycle to alleviate any grant cycle timeline issues.

Commissioner Kidder suggested that they change the grant cycles to May and November rather than June and December. Chair Schild reported that as long as the funding was scheduled for approval by City Council within the budget year there

should be no problems. She pointed out that changing the grant cycles would also provide staff with an additional six weeks to prepare the application packets for City Council.

Ms. Mead recalled that a separate account for Rock the House was approved and was no longer being deducted from the NEP funding. She reported that currently their funding balance was \$46,559.00 and the total of tonight's applications was approximately \$18,000 leaving a balance of \$28,000. Chair Schild reminded everyone that once tonight's applications were approved the \$18,000 would be subtracted from next year's budget of \$75,000.

Commissioner Lenko pointed out that if they did not deplete their funds they run the risk of City Council deciding to reduce the NEP program funding budget.

Ms. Mead distributed budget updates and explained that they summarized the past two months of funding expenses.

9. Open Call to the Public (A.R.S. § 38-431.02)

No members of the public wished to address the Committee.

10. Next Meeting Date and Future Agenda Items

Ms. Mead reported that tonight's grant applications would go before City Council for approval on July 10, 2007 and invited the Commissioners to attend the meeting for support. Chair Schild and Commissioner Badenoch agreed to attend.

Commissioner Kidder suggested that Connie Butler receive recognition for bringing their neighborhoods together for beautification projects. Chair Schild agreed to make a public comment at the City Council meeting demonstrating the Commission's appreciation of all the citizens coming together to create beautification projects.

Ms. Mead reported that she had discussed with Ms. Wallace the possibility of running a spot on City Cable 11 using some of the NEP program's excellent applicants.

Chair Schild confirmed that the next meeting would be held on July 11, 2007.

Ms. Mead stated that the next meeting would include a discussion on a Green Building demonstration project.

Chair Schild confirmed that the following meeting was scheduled for August 1, 2007 to discuss CPTED/crime prevention. Ms. Mead noted that Bruce Wall would be attending that meeting to discuss lighting surveys and crime statistics.

Ms. Mead reported that the Environmental Quality Advisory Board (EQAB) would also like to present on the Sustainability Indicators Report on either July 11th or August 1st. Chair Schild stated that due to the possible length of the Green Building discussion, Ms. Mead would have to balance out the speakers and presentations for the next couple of meetings.

Ms. Mead suggested that they move the Sustainability Indicators Report and Bylaws discussion to September 5, 2007. Commissioner Pompe reminded everyone that September would be the end of Commissioner Badenoch's second term.

Vice-Chair Kern suggested they agendaize a discussion to summarize the information gathered from the CPTED presentation in order to identify areas that would benefit from enhanced safety lighting.

Chair Schild requested that Ms. Mead agendaize a broad item for the August 1, 2007 meeting allowing for discussion and possible Commission action on the creation of a possible subcommittee to summarize the CPTED and lighting information.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 7:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
AV-Tronics, Inc.